

## REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 16, 2005 has been received and carefully reviewed. The preceding amendments and the following remarks form a full and complete response thereto. Claims 6 and 7 have been amended. No new matter has been added or amendments made which narrow the scope of any elements of any claims. Accordingly, claims 6-7 are pending in this application and are submitted for consideration.

Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of Wong, Diamond et al. and Smith. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and submit that claims 6-7 recite subject matter not shown or described by the combination of cited prior art.

One important feature of the electronic business transaction system and method according to the present invention recited in claims 6 and 7 is the step of performing a predefined STFC (Ship to First Commitment) computation procedure on an SQL (Structured Query Language) server to compute for a set of STFC data based on the received electronic purchase order. In other words, the STFC computation procedure according to the present invention is performed automatically by a SQL server, without requiring any additional human interaction. Therefore, the electronic business transaction system and method according to the present invention is more efficient and human-power-saving compared to the prior art.

Another important feature of the claimed invention is the provision of a WWW (World Wide Web) server for providing the FCT/STFC data via the Internet to the customer.

The combination of cited prior art fails to show or suggest these features.

In the Office Action, it was admitted that Wong and AAPA do not disclose using an STFC server to compute a predefined STFC computation. Smith was cited as providing this feature. However, Smith merely discloses searching an automotive product availability database for automotive products that match or substantially match a search request. Smith fails to disclose performing a predefined STFC (Ship to First Commitment) computation procedure on an SQL (Structured Query Language) server to compute for a set of STFC data based on a received electronic purchase order.

It was further admitted in the Office Action that the combination of Smith, Wong and AAPA fails to disclose “posting” the results of the STFC process “on” a web server. Diamond et al. was cited for supposedly disclosing “posting such obtained STFC data on the WWW server” because Diamond states “Web based HTML input forms may also be used to POST data directly into the relational database...” However, Diamond does not disclose making the results of an STFC computation available on a web server as claimed in claims 6 and 7. Instead, the term “post” as disclosed by Diamond et al. is a specific term relating to the insertion or updating of data into a relational database from an HTML form. See column 2, lines 37-48 and column 9, line 40 to column 10, line 10 of Diamond. In this sense, the act of POSTING data to a database describes the pre-COMMIT state of the data that is inserted. This is a well known term in the art

of database administration and can be found in, inter alia, any ORACLE database manual.

In contrast, claims 6-7 of the present invention make the data available on the obtained STFC data on the WWW server. Thus, Diamond et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of the combination of cited prior art, and the combination fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 6-7. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 6-7 is improper and request that the rejection be withdrawn and that claims 6-7 be allowed.

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application still is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account No. 02-2135.

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Brian A. Tollefson  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 46,338  
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, p.c.  
Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202)783-6040  
Facsimile: (202) 783-6031